Ham-Policy Digest   Wed, 11 Aug 93   Volume 93 : Issue 291

Today's Topics:
                        Digital Changes
      Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah (5 msgs)
                Neighbor's bad motor driving me nuts
                      New 97.113 - repost
      Use of Autopatch with College Audio Conferencing Brridge?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 10 Aug 93 15:36:35 GMT
From: olivea!isc-br!tau-ceti!comtch!jayt@ames.arpa
Subject: Digital Changes
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Wonder if there is any input on the changing support to the various
digital matters before the FCC? I see that a number of different
organizations have all started supporting each others positions.

--
jayt@comtch.computech.spk.wa.us (Jay Townsend)
IEAx for lack of a better name... (509) 624-0744

Date: 10 Aug 93 18:27:40 GMT
From: headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!paulf@RUTGERS.EDU

Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>I disagree that every learning process requires some rote memorization.

Well, then you're disagreeing with one of the fundamentals of cognitive
science. Good luck.

>I certainly didn't use any rote memorization in learning 1st year physics
>or calculus in high school. I could work everything from first principles.

Yes, you could work everything from first principles, but those first
principles were learned by rote, unless your name is Newton.

>Another simple example of the difference between learning and rote
>memorization is multiplication. Nearly every child is taught the concepts
>behind multiplication. They are also required to memorize their
>multiplication tables. That memorization adds little if anything to the
>learning process, but it does enable the child to learn additional concepts
>by removing the tedium of calculating the math facts contained in the
>multiplication tables.

That's not a difference, it's an enabling order. Sure, you could just let
the kids use calculators. The reason that this isn't done has nothing to
do with fondness for tradition (sound familiar?); it has to do with the fact
that you need to be able to perform the mental table manipulations later on
when you need to teach algebra.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: 10 Aug 1993 12:33:47 -0700
From: haven.umd.edu!cs.umd.edu!mojo.eng.umd.edu!news.isi.com!news.isi.com!not-for-
mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug7.035435.8159@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>I think his point was that learning Morse code is simply a matter of
>memorization. No additional knowledge or new concepts are learned in going
>from 1 WPM to 40 WPM. In both cases you either know the code or you don't.
>Whether it is recall or recognition has little to do with it. It is still
>rote memorization.

Correct!!! Just like driving a car is simply a matter of memorization of
the muscle actions involved. No additional knowledge or new concepts
are learned in going from 1 MPH to 220 MPH. So, it doesn't matter
whether you're driving a Ford Pinto or an Indy car, it's all exactly
the same...

--
Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com) | "Violence is the last refuge of
Integrated Systems, Inc. | the incompetent" - Isaac Asimov

Date: Wed, 11 Aug 1993 07:36:46 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jerry@isi.com (Jerry Gardner x323) writes:

>Correct!!! Just like driving a car is simply a matter of memorization of
>the muscle actions involved. No additional knowledge or new concepts
>are learned in going from 1 MPH to 220 MPH. So, it doesn't matter
>whether you're driving a Ford Pinto or an Indy car, it's all exactly
>the same...

Your point is?

In fact, if you're driving in a straight line on an empty highway and the
vehicle you're driving is suitable for traveling at 220 MPH, then I see
little difference between driving 1 MPH and 220 MPH. If on the other hand
you need to take into consideration the laws of physics, anticipated
actions of other drivers, knowledge of a race course, how weather and road
conditions affect traction, etc., then the analogy falls a little short.
Or is there *some* other knowledge other than abbreviations and pat QSO's
that one picks up in going from 5 WPM to 20 WPM? I sure don't recall any
additional knowledge required in going from 5 WPM to 15 WPM.

Please provide a single example of some new concept that is learned in
going from 5 WPM to 20 WPM.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

To reach 20 wpm and higher I had to go beyond hearing the individual letters
and rely on word recognition. Initially, we all begin learning the code
by memorizing the sound of each letter one at a time, no different than learning
a new language one word at a time (and here I sit with my Vietnamese
vocabulary cards in front of me!). If I hear didah I have to translate
it as the letter A; if I hear the Vietnamese word tie^'ng I have to
translate it as the word `language'. But as your code speed increases
something inexplainable happens; I can only relate it to the same process
of finally understanding a newly acquired foreign language: you no longer
have to mentally translate each word to English; it initially took word-by-
word memorization but you finally reach a point where understanding
replaces translation. I truely believe this same mental process applies
to higher speed code recognition.

Now Todd, et al: do we learn a language only by rote memorization or
does it require more complex mental processes? Hopefully you'll answer
by saying "both". Good. Now replace the word `language' with the word
`code'.

Right now you might actually believe that code only involves some rote
process; but some day, as your code speed increases, you will know better!

73 es 72,

Jeff NH6IL

Jeffrey Herman, University of Hawaii Mathematics, jherman@hawaii.edu

----

paulf@Csli.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:
>
>>I disagree that every learning process requires some rote memorization.
>
>Well, then you're disagreeing with one of the fundamentals of cognitive
>science. Good luck.
>
>>I certainly didn't use any rote memorization in learning 1st year physics
>>or calculus in high school. I could work everything from first principles.
>
>Yes, you could work everything from first principles, but those first
>principles were learned by rote, unless your name is Newton.

Funny, but I recall no *rote* memorization of first principles and my name
isn't Newton. Are you suggesting that only Newton could observe physical
laws and cast them in the form of some simple equations? My recollection
of first principles was that they provided a concise form of expressing
what I had already observed at that point in time. So a realization was
made that certain equalities could be stated, but certainly no *rote*
memorization was required to grasp, understand, or otherwise utilize those
equalities. Again, check the definition of *rote*. It means mindless
repetition without understanding. Sort of like the arguments in this
newsgroup.

>>Another simple example of the difference between learning and rote
>>memorization is multiplication. Nearly every child is taught the concepts
>>behind multiplication. They are also required to memorize their
>>multiplication tables. That memorization adds little if anything to the
>>learning process, but it does enable the child to learn additional concepts
>>by removing the tedium of calculating the math facts contained in the
>>multiplication tables.
>
>That's not a difference, it's an enabling order. Sure, you could just let
>the kids use calculators. The reason that this isn't done has nothing to
>do with fondness for tradition (sound familiar?); it has to do with the fact
>that you need to be able to perform the mental table manipulations later on
>when you need to teach algebra.

Say what? What do multiplication tables have to do with Algebra? They do
not form a basis for Algebra. Multiplication and division are part of
the basis for Algebra, but not memorized tables. One can solve for X in
10X+10=60 without having memorized the multiplication tables as easily as
one can solve 375*941. Both can be solved quicker by having the
multiplication tables memorized, but both are still completely solveable if
you understand the *concepts* of multiplication and division.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Mon, 9 Aug 1993 18:52:34 GMT
From: usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpcc05!hpwrce!
tonyz@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Neighbor's bad motor driving me nuts
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

My experience with RFI and the FCC ocurred circa 1984.
I found that I was encountered with intermittent broadband RFI.
I didn't know what it was, and decided to use an old transistor AM
radio to isolate the source. I found the RFI to be coming from a
neighbor's house and called the FCC. They suggested that I inform
the fire dept. since the source was probably caused by something
arcing. I am glad I did. The fire dept. found a defective electric
blanket that could have caused a serious fire and worse, loss of life.
The fire dept. officials said that they welcomed calls like this,
that not only does it save lives, and also save them from having to
put out a fire and risk their own lives, but that this was their job.

You might be able to convince your local fire dept. to check the
electrical system out for any arcing etc. that might cause a fire.

It worked for me.
Good Luck.. I don't think the FCC can do much about it, since it
is not "electronic" in nature...but I may be wrong.

Tony WB6TRU

Date: Wed, 11 Aug 1993 01:24:53 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!spssig.spss.com!feenix.metronet.com!
marcbg@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: New 97.113 - repost
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

For those of you who didn't catch it the first time around, here it is
again:The following is the 1993 change to FCC rule 97.113

    97.113 Prohibited transmissions.

(a) No amateur station shall transmit:

(1) Communications specifically prohibited elsewhere in this Part:

(2) Communications for hire or for material compensation, direct or indirect, paid or promised, except as otherwise provided in these rules;

(3) Communications in which the station licensee or control operator has a pecuniary interest, including communications on behalf of an employer. Amateur operators may, however, notify other amateur operators of the availability for sale or trade, of apparatus normally used in an amateur station, provided that such activity is not conducted on a regular basis;

(4) Music using a phone emission except as specifically provided elsewhere in this Section; Communications intended to facilitate a criminal act; Messages in codes or ciphers intended to obscure the meaning thereof, except as otherwise provided herein; Obscene or indecent words or language; or false or deceptive messages, signals, or identification;

(5) Communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably be furnished alternatively through other radio services.

(b) An amateur station shall not engage in any form of broadcasting, nor may an amateur station transmit one-way communications except as specifically provided in these rules; nor shall an amateur station engage in any activity related to program production or newsgathering for broadcasting purposes, except that communications directly related to the immediate safety of human life or the protection of property may be provided by amateur stations to broadcasters for dissemination to the public where no other means of communication is reasonably available before or at the time of the event.
(c) A control operator may accept compensation as an incident of a teaching position during periods of time when an amateur station is used by that teacher as a part of classroom instruction at an educational institution.
(d) A control operator of a club station may accept compensation for the periods of time when the station is transmitting telegraphy practice or information bulletins, provided that the station transmits such telegraphy practice and bulletins for at least 40 hours per week; schedules operations on at least six amateur service MF and HF bands using reasonable measures to maximize coverage; where the schedule of normal operating times and frequencies is published at least 30 days in advance of the actual transmissions; and where the control operator does not accept any direct or indirect compensation for any other service as a control operator.
(e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except

propagation and weather forecast information intended for use
by the general public and originated from United States Government
stations,
and communications, including incidental music, originating on United
States Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated
Earth stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be
obtained from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such
retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators.
Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be
conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of
normal amateur radio communications.
     (f) No amateur station, except an auxiliary, repeater or space
station, may automatically retransmit the radio signals of other
amateur stations.

--
Marc B. Grant, N5MEI | marcbg@feenix.metronet.com | 214/231-3998 (voice)
P.O Box 850472 | marcbg@esy.com | 214/231-0025 (fax)
Richardson, TX 75085 | |

Date: 10 Aug 93 13:09:31
From: zip.eecs.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!hideg@yale.arpa
Subject: Use of Autopatch with College Audio Conferencing Brridge?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug7.022928.17950@ennews.eas.asu.edu> shandrow@enuxsa.eas.asu.edu
(Darrell B Shandrow) writes:

>   Secondly, the autopatch is really supposed to be used for short calls and
>   not for a class that would last at least an hour.

Is there an autopatch time limit stated in thr FCC rules?????

--Steve, N8HSC
  hideg@erim.org

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 1993 20:44:36 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug4.075341.1@ttd.teradyne.com>,
<1993Aug6.153628.24354@ke4zv.uucp>, <CBIM4v.AGF@world.std.com>ento
Reply-To : Hank_Oredson@mentorg.com

Subject : Re: Techs on 20M ? Crossband repeat.

In article <CBIM4v.AGF@world.std.com>, dts@world.std.com (Daniel T Senie) writes:
|> Third party and repeaters...
|>
|> The discussion has come around to the case of 10 meter repeaters, where the
|> repeater setup is legal in and of itself, so now let us address the 3rd party
|> issue...
|>
|> The 3rd party rules in the USA (possibly different elsewhere) deal with the
|> difference between LICENSED and UNLICENSED individuals. PERIOD. The rules
|> do not distinguish between license classes with regard to 3rd party.
|>
|> Any licensed ham in the US may pass message traffic to ANY ham in the world,
|> in any country, regardless of the presence or absence of a 3rd party
|> agreement. There is NO "third-party" when sender and recipient are
|> hams.
|>
|> With the repeater case, the "message" gets there a little faster, but is
|> the same. I think we hashed all this out right after field day with the
|> question of a Novice or Tech operating the 20 meter station with a control
|> operator...
|>
|> --
|> --
|> Daniel Senie   Internet: dts@world.std.com
|> Daniel Senie Consulting   n1jeb@world.std.com
|> 508-365-5352   Compuserve: 74176,1347

--

When did the definition of "third party" change?

Can someone quote part 97 or point me to the section that
has this change?

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet   : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: W0RLI@W0RLI.OR.USA.NA

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 1993 18:06:48 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!enuxsa.eas.asu.edu!
shandrow@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug5.112254.6156@ultb.isc.rit.edu>,

<1993Aug7.022928.17950@ennews.eas.asu.edu>,
<HIDEG.93Aug10130931@spsd10b.erim.org>p
Subject : Re: Use of Autopatch with College Audio Conferencing Brridge?

Of course, you are correct. There is no specifically stated time limit for auto
patch calls in the fcc rules.
However, I recall say8ing, while not an fcc ruling, it is a matter of ethics in
the amateur radio community. The patch is not a cellular telephone and should not
be used in that way. What if someone has an emergency while you're doing your
class thing??? After all, emergency operation is the primary use of the auto
patch anyway. I still say don't do it! Use a cellular telephone for that. 73

Date: 10 Aug 1993 19:26:41 GMT
From: drt@athena.mit.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug4.075341.1@ttd.teradyne.com>,
<1993Aug6.153628.24354@ke4zv.uucp>, <CBIM4v.AGF@world.std.com>.edu
Subject : Re: Techs on 20M ? Crossband repeat.

In article <CBIM4v.AGF@world.std.com>, dts@world.std.com (Daniel T Senie) writes:
|> Third party and repeaters...
|>
|> The discussion has come around to the case of 10 meter repeaters, where the
|> repeater setup is legal in and of itself, so now let us address the 3rd party
|> issue...
|>
|> The 3rd party rules in the USA (possibly different elsewhere) deal with the
|> difference between LICENSED and UNLICENSED individuals. PERIOD. The rules
|> do not distinguish between license classes with regard to 3rd party.
|>
|> Any licensed ham in the US may pass message traffic to ANY ham in the world,
|> in any country, regardless of the presence or absence of a 3rd party
|> agreement. There is NO "third-party" when sender and recipient are
|> hams.
|> [deletions]
|> --
|> --
|> Daniel Senie   Internet: dts@world.std.com
|> Daniel Senie Consulting   n1jeb@world.std.com
|> 508-365-5352   Compuserve: 74176,1347

This may well be. I certainly hope so. But, Daniel, I have to ask you to
explain what this means:

(97.115a)

(2)...No station shall transmit messages for a third party to any station
within the jurisdiction of any foreign government whose administration has
not made such an arrangement. THIS PROHIBITION DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY
MESSAGE FOR ANY THIRD PARTY WHO IS ELIGIBLE TO THE *A* CONTROL OPERATOR
FOR *THE* STATION. (emphases added)

Gee, it seems there *are* amateurs who are third parties. It also seems
they have to be eligible to *control* the station they're being patched
into, for foreign traffic without a specific third party agreement to be
legal.

Furthermore, (97.115b(1)) forbids automatic control during any third party
operations.

97.3(42) "*Third Party Communications.* A message from the *control
operator* (first party) of an amateur station to another amateur station
control operator (second party) on behalf of *another person* (third
party)."

Nothing about the third party not being a third party if he holds any
class of license, is there? (No, there isn't.)

So the dilemma is this:

Someone puts up a repeater, and a user transmits on the input legally.
His signal is relayed automatically but locally on a frequency the user
cannot himself use. The repeater rules make clear that this is okay.
Repeaters aren't really "third party traffic" since this is what repeaters
are specifically *for*. And repeaters clearly may be automatically
controlled.

But if that user goes through a link onto 10 meters where he can't
transmit as control op, and then talks to Great Britain during a band
opening, that's going to violate an ITU *treaty* of which the U.S. is a
signatory (International Radio Regulations, Article 32.2.2.), because the
user can't be the contol op. So the Control Op winds up violating
international radio law, even though he wasn't there because US law allows
him to use automatic contol. Perhaps the user should be held responsible
for knowing that only a 10m link could get him into Europe, and shouldn't
talk to Europe on any repeater? But then, I thought what he was doing, on
his own frequency, was legal?

Or maybe this is rare enough that no one will ever notice the user's
license class.

Bizarre.

But any way you slice it, it is quite possible for international 3d

party traffic involving 3 licensed amateurs to be illegal, like when
the 3d party cannot control the 1st party's station, or whatever.

-drt

--

|David R. Tucker   KG2S   drt@athena.mit.edu|

|`Most political sermons tech the congregation nothing except |
|what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis |

Date: 10 Aug 93 21:03:21 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug9.200802.11751@Csli.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Aug10.005040.1981@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993Aug10.182740.493@Csli.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah

In article <1993Aug10.182740.493@Csli.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csli.Stanford.EDU (Paul
Flaherty) writes:
>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:
>
>>I certainly didn't use any rote memorization in learning 1st year physics
>>or calculus in high school. I could work everything from first principles.
>
>Yes, you could work everything from first principles, but those first
>principles were learned by rote, unless your name is Newton.

Even he had to learn some by rote memorization. (He didn't invent
everything.) I suppose you'd have to be Adam to not do any rote memorization.

(Yes, I guess I am agreeing with you yet again, Paul!!)

--
Will Turner, N0RDV   --
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov   --

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #291
****